

HON. BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DAVID WILNER, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

OKTA, INC., a Delaware corporation;
TODD MCKINNON, an individual,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR

**STIPULATED MOTION
REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED
INFORMATION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff David Wilner and Defendants Okta, Inc. and Todd McKinnon (collectively, the “Parties”), hereby stipulate to and request that the Proposed Electronic Discovery Order as attached hereto as **Exhibit A** be entered by the Court in the above-referenced case (the “Litigation”).

DATED this 15th day of April 2022.

McNAUL EBEL NAWROT
& HELGREN PLLC

K&L GATES, LLP

By: /s/ Daniel M. Weiskopf/
Daniel M. Weiskopf, WSBA #44941
dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
Claire Martirosian, WSBA #49528
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff David Wilner

STIPULATED MOTION RE DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION &
ORDER - 1
CAUSE NO. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR
505682781.1

By: /s/ Mark S. Filipini
Mark S. Filipini, WSBA #32501
mark.filipini@klgates.com
Michael W. Meredith, WSBA #45264
michael.meredith@klgates.com
Ruby A. Nagamine, WSBA #55620
ruby.nagamine@klgates.com

K&L GATES LLP
925 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

*Attorneys for Defendants Okta, Inc and Todd
McKinnon*

STIPULATED MOTION RE DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION &
ORDER - 2
CAUSE NO. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR
505682781.1

K&L GATES LLP
925 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 22, 2022



HONORABLE BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented By:

McNAUL EBEL NAWROT
& HELGREN PLLC

K&L GATES, LLP

By: /s/ Daniel M. Weiskopf/
Daniel M. Weiskopf, WSBA #44941
dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
Claire Martirosian, WSBA #49528
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff David Wilner

By: /s/ Mark S. Filipini
Mark S. Filipini, WSBA #32501
mark.filipini@klgates.com
Michael W. Meredith, WSBA #45264
michael.meredith@klgates.com
Ruby A. Nagamine, WSBA #55620
ruby.nagamine@klgates.com

Attorneys for Defendants Okta, Inc and Todd McKinnon

STIPULATED MOTION RE DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION &
ORDER - 3
CAUSE NO. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR
505682781.1

K&L GATES LLP
925 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15th day of February 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Counsel for Plaintiff

Daniel M. Weiskopf
Claire Martirosian
McNaul Ebel Nawrot & Helgren PLLC,
600 University Street, Suite 2700,
Seattle, Washington 98101
dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

And I hereby certify that I have forwarded by means indicated below the document to the following:

Counsel for Plaintiff

Daniel M. Weiskopf
Claire Martirosian
McNaul Ebel Nawrot & Helgren PLLC,
600 University Street, Suite 2700,
Seattle, Washington 98101
dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

- ☒ Via Email
☐ Via First Class Mail
☐ Via Hand Delivery
☐ Via CM/ECF

SIGNED at Suquamish, Washington this 15th day of February 2022.

/s/ Sabrina Mitchell

Sabrina Mitchell
Sr. Practice Assistant

STIPULATED MOTION RE DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION &
ORDER - 4
CAUSE NO. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR
505682781.1

K&L GATES LLP
925 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DAVID WILNER, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

OKTA, INC., a Delaware corporation;
TODD MCKINNON, an individual,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00169-BJR

**AGREEMENT REGARDING
DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED
INFORMATION AND ORDER**

The parties hereby stipulate to the following provisions regarding the discovery of electronically stored information (“ESI”) in this matter:

A. General Principles

1. An attorney’s zealous representation of a client is not compromised by conducting discovery in a cooperative manner. The failure of counsel or the parties to litigation to cooperate in facilitating and reasonably limiting discovery requests and responses raises litigation costs and contributes to the risk of sanctions.

2. As provided in LCR 26(f), the proportionality standard set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) must be applied in each case when formulating a discovery plan. To further the application of the proportionality standard in discovery, requests for production of ESI and related responses should be reasonably targeted, clear, and as specific as possible.

1 **B. ESI Disclosures**

2 Within 30 days of entry of this Order, or at a later time if agreed to by the parties, each
3 party shall disclose:

4 1. Custodians. The five custodians most likely to have discoverable ESI in their
5 possession, custody, or control. The custodians shall be identified by name, title, connection to
6 the instant litigation, and the type of the information under the custodian's control.

7 2. Non-custodial Data Sources. A list of non-custodial data sources (*e.g.*, shared
8 drives, servers), if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI.

9 3. Third-Party Data Sources. A list of third-party data sources, if any, likely to
10 contain discoverable ESI (*e.g.*, third-party email providers, mobile device providers, cloud
11 storage) and, for each such source, the extent to which a party is (or is not) able to preserve
12 information stored in the third-party data source.

13 4. Inaccessible Data. A list of data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI
14 (by type, date, custodian, electronic system or other criteria sufficient to specifically identify the
15 data source) that a party asserts is not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

16 **C. ESI Discovery Procedures**

17 1. On-site inspection of electronic media. Such an inspection shall not be required
18 absent a demonstration by the requesting party of specific need and good cause or by agreement
19 of the parties.

20 2. Search methodology. The parties shall timely confer to attempt to reach agreement
21 on appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources (including
22 custodians), and other appropriate computer- or technology-aided methodologies, before any such
23

1 effort is undertaken. The parties shall continue to cooperate in revising the appropriateness of the
2 search methodology.

3 a. Prior to running searches:

4 i. The producing party shall disclose the data sources (including
5 custodians), search terms and queries, any file type and date restrictions, and any other
6 methodology that it proposes to use to locate ESI likely to contain responsive and discoverable
7 information. The producing party may provide unique hit counts for each search query.

8 ii. The requesting party is entitled to, within 14 days of the producing
9 party's disclosure, add no more than 10 search terms or queries to those disclosed by the
10 producing party absent a showing of good cause or agreement of the parties.

11 iii. The following provisions apply to search terms / queries of the
12 requesting party. Focused terms and queries should be employed; broad terms or queries, such
13 as product and company names, generally should be avoided. A conjunctive combination of
14 multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as
15 a single search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer"
16 or "system") broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search
17 term unless they are variants of the same word. The producing party may identify each search
18 term or query returning overbroad results demonstrating the overbroad results and a counter
19 proposal correcting the overbroad search or query.

20 b. After production: Within 21 days of the producing party notifying
21 the receiving party that it has substantially completed the production of documents responsive to
22 a request, the responding party may request no more than 10 additional search terms or queries.
23 The immediately preceding section (Section C(2)(a)(iii)) applies.

3. Format.

a. ESI will be produced to the requesting party with searchable text, in a format to be decided between the parties. Acceptable formats include, but are not limited to, native files, multi-page TIFFs (with a companion OCR or extracted text file), single-page TIFFs (only with load files for e-discovery software that includes metadata fields identifying natural document breaks and also includes companion OCR and/or extracted text files), and searchable PDF.

b. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, files that are not easily converted to image format, such as spreadsheet, database, and drawing files, will be produced in native format.

c. Each document image file shall be named with a unique number (Bates Number). File names should not be more than twenty characters long or contain spaces. When a text-searchable image file is produced, the producing party must preserve the integrity of the underlying ESI, *i.e.*, the original formatting, the metadata (as noted below) and, where applicable, the revision history.

d. If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the original document.

e. The parties shall produce their information in the following format: single-page images and associated multi-page text files containing extracted text or with appropriate software load files containing all information required by the litigation support system used by the receiving party.

f. The full text of each electronic document shall be extracted ("Extracted Text") and produced in a text file. The Extracted Text shall be provided in searchable ASCII text format (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language) and shall be named with a

1 unique Bates Number (*e.g.*, the unique Bates Number of the first page of the corresponding
2 production version of the document followed by its file extension).

3 4. De-duplication. The parties may de-duplicate their ESI production across custodial
4 and non-custodial data sources after disclosure to the requesting party, and the duplicate custodian
5 information removed during the de-duplication process tracked in a duplicate/other custodian
6 field in the database load file.

7 5. Email Threading. The parties may use analytics technology to identify email
8 threads and need only produce the unique most inclusive copy and related family members and
9 may exclude lesser inclusive copies. Upon reasonable request, the producing party will produce
10 a less inclusive copy.

11 6. Metadata fields. If the requesting party seeks metadata, the parties agree that only
12 the following metadata fields need be produced, and only to the extent it is reasonably accessible
13 and non-privileged: document type; custodian and duplicate custodians (or storage location if no
14 custodian); author/from; recipient/to, cc and bcc; title/subject; email subject; file name; file size;
15 file extension; original file path; date and time created, sent, modified and/or received; and hash
16 value. The list of metadata type is intended to be flexible and may be changed by agreement of
17 the parties, particularly in light of advances and changes in technology, vendor, and business
18 practices.

19 **D. Preservation of ESI**

20 The parties acknowledge that they have a common law obligation, as expressed in Fed. R.
21 Civ. P. 37(e), to take reasonable and proportional steps to preserve discoverable information in
22 the party's possession, custody, or control. With respect to preservation of ESI, the parties agree
23 as follows:

1 1. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the parties shall not be
2 required to modify the procedures used by them in the ordinary course of business to back-up and
3 archive data; provided, however, that the parties shall preserve all discoverable ESI in their
4 possession, custody, or control.

5 2. The parties will supplement their disclosures in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P.
6 26(e) with discoverable ESI responsive to a particular discovery request or mandatory disclosure
7 where that data is created after a disclosure or response is made (unless excluded under Sections
8 (D)(3) or (E)(1)-(2)).

9 3. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the following categories
10 of ESI need not be preserved:

- 11 a. Deleted, slack, fragmented, or other data only accessible by forensics.
- 12 b. Random access memory (RAM), temporary files, or other ephemeral data
13 that are difficult to preserve without disabling the operating system.
- 14 c. On-line access data such as temporary internet files, history, cache,
15 cookies, and the like.
- 16 d. Data in metadata fields that are frequently updated automatically, such as
17 last-opened dates (see also Section (E)(5)).
- 18 e. Back-up data that are duplicative of data that are more accessible
19 elsewhere.
- 20 f. Server, system or network logs.
- 21 g. Data remaining from systems no longer in use that is unintelligible on the
22 systems in use.
- 23 h. Electronic data (*e.g.*, email, calendars, contact data, and notes) sent to or
24 from mobile devices (*e.g.*, iPhone, iPad, Android devices), provided that
25 a copy of all such electronic data is automatically saved in real time
26 elsewhere (such as on a server, laptop, desktop computer, or “cloud”
 storage).

24 **E. Privilege**

1 1. A producing party shall create a privilege log of all documents fully withheld from
2 production on the basis of a privilege or protection, unless otherwise agreed or excepted by this
3 Agreement and Order. Privilege logs shall include a unique identification number for each
4 document and the basis for the claim (attorney-client privileged or work-product protection). For
5 ESI, the privilege log may be generated using available metadata, including author/recipient or
6 to/from/cc/bcc names; the subject matter or title; and date created. Should the available metadata
7 provide insufficient information for the purpose of evaluating the privilege claim asserted, the
8 producing party shall include such additional information as required by the Federal Rules of
9 Civil Procedure. Privilege logs will be produced to all other parties no later than 30 days after
10 delivering the final production.

11 2. Redactions need not be logged so long as the basis for the redaction is clear on the
12 redacted document.

13 3. With respect to privileged or work-product information generated after the filing
14 of the complaint, parties are not required to include any such information in privilege logs.

15 4. Activities undertaken in compliance with the duty to preserve information are
16 protected from disclosure and discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A) and (B).

17 5. Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 502(d), the production of any documents in this
18 proceeding shall not, for the purposes of this proceeding or any other federal or state proceeding,
19 constitute a waiver by the producing party of any privilege applicable to those documents,
20 including the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product protection, or any other privilege
21 or protection recognized by law. Information produced in discovery that is protected as privileged
22 or work product shall be immediately returned to the producing party, and its production shall not
23 constitute a waiver of such protection.

DATED this 15th day of April 2022.

McNAUL EBEL NAWROT
& HELGREN PLLC

K&L GATES, LLP

By: /s/ Daniel M. Weiskopf/
Daniel M. Weiskopf, WSBA #44941
dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
Claire Martirosian, WSBA #49528
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff David Wilner

By: /s/ Mark S. Filipini
Mark S. Filipini, WSBA #32501
mark.filipini@klgates.com
Michael W. Meredith, WSBA #45264
michael.meredith@klgates.com
Ruby A. Nagamine, WSBA #55620
ruby.nagamine@klgates.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Okta, Inc and Todd
McKinnon*